REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 were pending and have been rejected by the Examiner. Applicants have amended Claim 1. Claims 5 and17-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-16 are presented and at issue. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview Summary

The undersigned conducted an interview with Examiner Hussain on Tuesday, May 27, 2008 and would like to thank Examiner Hussain for the courtesies extended during the interview. During that interview, the scope of prior art was discussed. In particular, the undersigned requested clarification of paragraph [0042] of the teaching of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0038610 (Omoigul) as they applied to claim 5. The undersigned asserted that paragraph [0042] of Omoigul did not teach a method wherein query results are sent back to said client in a format as requested using a transformation processor as recited in claim 5. At the time of the interview, the Examiner was not in a position to agree or disagree with that assertion. As such, no agreement was reached with respect to the allowability of claim 5. As agreed in the interview, claim 1 has been amended herein to include the limitation of claim 5.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been cancelled. The rejections thereto are thus moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-12, 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman (Patent No. 6,256,773). Claim 4 stands rejected **under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,747). Claims 5-6, 10 and 13 stand rejected under under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman as applied to claims 1-3 in view of Omoigul.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 5 (which depended directly therefrom). As such, the following discussion deals only with the rejection of claim 5.

The office action asserts that Omoigul at paragraph [0042] teaches a method wherein query results are sent back to said client in a format as requested using a transformation processor as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, the office action states that this limitation is taught because paragraph [0042] of Omoigul sends the result back to requester in the requested format because search engine converts "the natural language [search string] in to web define language and convert the results back to natural language before sending the results back to sender." Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Omoigul does not teach or suggest that the search results are converted back to natural language. As one of ordinary skill in the art will readily realize, natural language searching is merely a description of means by which the search is described. For example, if searching for prior art references on a database, an Examiner could simply type in the title of the application being examined using a searching service such as Google Patents. The natural language query (the title) is then converted to a computer usable representation of the query. For example, the title of this Application could be converted to Gateway & Service & Oriented & State which would require the results to have those particular words contained therein. As one of skill in that will realize, the results of this search may be a list of patents and patent applications. The format of the result, however, is not converted back to natural language. It is not converted at all, the result is just the result.

Second, Omoigul does not teach or suggest that the result be sent back to the client in a requested format as recited in amended claim 1. Omoigul does not even mention that the result may be sent in a particular format, much less a requested format.

Furthermore, because Omoigul does not teach or suggest that the result be sent in particular requested format, Omoigul does not teach or suggest that the query results are sent back to the client in format as requested using a transformation processor. Because no transformation is discussed in Omoigul, Omoigul does not teach or suggest using a transformation processor.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the cited references. The fact that no cited references other than Omoigul are discussed above does not indicate Applicants agreement with the office action's characterization of those references teachings.

Claims 2-4 and 6-16 depend from amended claim 1 and, thus, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If a communication with Applicant's Attorneys would assist in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that any such issues may be promptly resolved.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is

hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Applicant's Attorneys

By:___/M. Brad Lawrence/___

Dated this 30th day of May, 2008

M. Brad Lawrence, Esq.
Registration No: 47,210
Customer No. 46429

Address: 20 Church St, 22nd Floor, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115